



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/552,985	04/21/2000	Sai V. Allavarpu	5181-46200	7125
7590		08/24/2007		
Robert C Kowert Conley Rose & Tayon PC P O Box 398 Austin, TX 78767			EXAMINER DINH, KHANH Q	
			ART UNIT 2151	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/24/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No. 09/552,985	Applicant(s) ALLAVARPU ET AL.	
	Examiner Khanh Dinh	Art Unit 2151	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
Khanh Dinh  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 2151

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant asserts that the cited references do not disclose "generating a request for type information and sending a request for type information from an object request broker; wherein the type information to management one or more managed network objects" and the reference teaches away from the Applicant's claimed invention.

Examiner respectfully point out that Carre discloses the Applicant claimed invention by showing "generating a request for type information and sending a request for type information from an object request broker, wherein the type information to management one or more managed network objects (managing operations such as OSI objects on the Agent upon requests from the Manager unit (M fig.2a) by communicating via the Network Management Protocol CMIP, wherein the OSI objects including in different specification languages such as COBRA IDL, ASN.1) (translation of COBRA address types from OSI types, see abstract, figs.2a, 3a, abstract, col.3 lines 18 to col.5 line 62 and col.6 lines 10-35) as rejected above. Thus, the reference does not teach away from the Applicant's claimed invention.

Applicant further asserts that the cited references do not disclose a metadata gateway to receive the request for translated type information from the object broker.

Examiner respectfully point out that the combination of the references discloses the Applicant's claimed invention. For example, Carre discloses "generating a request for type information and sending a request for type information from an object request broker (managing operations such as OSI objects on the Agent upon requests from the Manager unit (M fig.2a) by communicating via the Network Management Protocol CMIP, wherein the OSI objects including in different specification languages such as COBRA IDL, ASN.1) (translation of COBRA address types from OSI types, see abstract, figs.2a, 3a, abstract, col.3 lines 18 to col.5 line 62 and col.6 lines 10-35). Carre does not specifically disclose a metadata gateway. However, Hamilton discloses a metadata gateway (using subcontract server 58 fig.1 for performing data marshalling and other operations of method invocations and the resulting return messages between server 24 fig.1 and the client computer 22 fig.1, see fig.1, abstract, col.3 lines 5-67 and col.col.4 lines 14-60). It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Hamilton's teachings into the computer system of Carre to process data information because it would have controlled object invocations and supported the transport of method invocations in a communications network. Therefore, the combination of the references does discloses the Applicant claimed invention.

Applicant further asserts that the cited references do not disclose translating the type information from an interface definition language to a database format storing the type information in a metadata repository.

Examiner respectfully point out that the Carre reference discloses translating the type information from an interface definition language to a database format storing the type information in a metadata repository (using CMISE/IDL fig.3a) (using IDL protocol translation services, see abstract, figs.2a, 3a, abstract, col.3 lines 18-55 and col.5 lines 39-65), wherein the type information is stored in a database format in the metadata repository (storing the OSI or COBRA structures for particular addresses already in the entity for later uses, see col.6 lines 1-35).

Therefore, Examiner respectfully maintained the rejection.